



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,322	12/03/2003	Victor S. Chan	CA920030029US1	6214
50170 7590 11/28/2007 IBM CORP. (WIP) c/o WALDER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, P.C. P.O. BOX 832745 RICHARDSON, TX 75083			EXAMINER ABEDIN, SHANTO	
			ART UNIT 2136	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/28/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/727,322	Applicant(s) CHAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Shanto M Z Abedin	Art Unit 2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-13, 15-22 and 24-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-13, 15-22 and 24-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to communications filed on 09/14/2007.
2. Claims 1- 4, 6-13, 15-22 and 24-27 have been presented for examination.
3. Claims 1- 4, 6-13, 15-22 and 24-27 have been rejected.

Response to Arguments

4. The applicant's arguments regarding the previous 35 USC 101 type rejections are fully considered and found persuasive, therefore, the previous 35 USC 101 type rejections of claims 10-18 are withdrawn.
5. The applicant's arguments regarding the previous 35 USC 102 type rejections are fully considered, however, these arguments are moot in view of newly found ground of rejection (please see below for detail).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1- 4, 6-13, 15-22 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Wood et al (US 6668322 B1) in view of Low et al (US 6996605 B2) further in view of Hinton et al (US 6993596 B2).

Regarding claim 1 and 19, Wood et al discloses a method/ system for managing multiple user identities for a user of an electronic commerce (e-commerce) site, the method comprising:

defining the e-commerce site as a plurality of security domains (Col 13, lines 1-20; Col 15, starting at line 9; security architecture; controlling access to several/ multi level domains); and

in response to a user's request to invoke an operation of the e-commerce site:

determining a security domain of the plurality of security domains to which the operation relates (Fig 4.410: domainId; Col 13, lines 1-20; Col 15, starting at line 9; Col 16, starting at line 35; session credentials/ tokens for persistent/ subsequent sessions; accessing resources in several/ multi level domains) ; and

reusing the session for the user automatically in accordance with the determined security domain, the selected session being associated with a user identity and a role, the user identity and role together indicating privileges for invoking operations of the e-commerce site in at least the determined security domain; and persisting said session for reuse (Col 11, starting at line 11; Col 16, starting at line 50; session creation; Col 8, starting at line 9; Col 13, starting at line 5; Col 15, starting at line 8; Col 16, starting at line 35; Claim 1,12; session credentials/ tokens for persistent/ subsequent sessions).

Wood et al fails to disclose selecting a session from a plurality of sessions persisted for the user based on the determined security domain.

However, Low et al discloses selecting a session from a plurality of sessions persisted for the user (Col 2, line 6 -42; Col 13, line 15-67; Claims 1-13; user selecting a session to join from plurality of sessions), and

Hinton et al discloses selecting a session persisted for the user based on the determined security domain (Col 5, line 1 – Col 8, line 67; Claims 1-9; user selecting one of multiple sessions related to multiple security domain; vouching affiliated domain identity for session authentication). Hinton et al further discloses determining a security domain of the plurality of security domains to which the operation relates (Col 17, line 10 to Col 19, line 30; using user identity and/ or role, and domain ID) and the selected session being associated with a user identity and a role, the user identity and role together indicating privileges for invoking operations of the e-commerce site in at least the determined security domain (Col 17, line 10 to Col 19, line 30).

Hinton et al , Low et al and Wood et al are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of session management. At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Hinton et al or Low et al with Wood et al to design a method further comprising the step of selecting a session from a plurality of sessions persisted for the user based on the determined security domain in order to provide user with multiple session access.

Regarding claim 10, it is rejected applying as above rejecting claim 1, furthermore, Wood et al discloses a computer readable medium tangibly embodying computer executable code for managing multiple user identities for a user of an electronic commerce (e-commerce) site defined using the plurality of security domains, wherein the computer executable code, when executed on a computing device, causes the computing device to:

in response to a user's request to invoke an operation of the e-commerce site (Fig 2; operations after step 201: access requests; Col 6, line 44-56; Col 15, starting at line 8; handling access requests; resource identification):

determining a security domain of the plurality of the security domains to which the operation relates (Fig 4.410: domainId; Col 13, lines 1-20; Col 15, starting at line 9; accessing resources in several/ multi level domains);

reusing the session for the user automatically in accordance with the determined security domain, the selected session being associated with a user identity and a role, the user identity and role together indicating privileges for invoking operations of the e-commerce site in at least the determined security domain; and persisting said session for reuse (Col 11, starting at line 11; Col 16, starting at line 50; session creation; Col 8, starting at line 9; Col 13, starting at line 5; Col 15, starting at line 8; Col 16, starting at line 35; Claim 1,12; session credentials/ tokens for persistent/ subsequent sessions).

Wood et al fails to disclose selecting a session from a plurality of sessions persisted for the user based on the determined security domain.

However, Low et al discloses selecting a session from a plurality of sessions persisted for the user (Col 2, line 6 -42; Col 13, line 15-67; Claims 1-13; user selecting a session to join from plurality of sessions), and

Hinton et al discloses selecting a session persisted for the user based on the determined security domain (Col 5, line 1 – Col 8, line 67; Claims 1-9; user selecting one of multiple sessions related to multiple security domain; vouching affiliated domain identity for session authentication). Hinton et al further discloses determining a security domain of the plurality of security domains to which the operation relates (Col 17, line 10 to Col 19, line 30; using user identity and/ or role, and domain ID) and the selected session being associated with a user identity and a role, the user identity and role together indicating privileges for invoking operations of the e-commerce site in at least the determined security domain (Col 17, line 10 to Col 19, line 30).

Regarding claim 2, it is rejected applying as above rejecting claim 1, furthermore, Wood et al discloses the method comprising invoking the requested operation with the user identity and the role of the selected session (Col 10, starting at line 63; Col 16, starting at line 35, session objects; access requests).

Furthermore, Hinton et al discloses invoking the requested operation with the user identity and the role of the selected session (Col 17, line 40 to Col 19, line 30; using identity, and selected ecommunity ID in request).

Regarding claim 3, it is rejected applying as above rejecting claim 2, furthermore, Wood et al discloses the method wherein the selected session comprises information indicating at least one of: the user preference's for invoking operations at the e-commerce site; the user's preferences for invoking operations at least the determined security domain (Col 12, starts at line 66; Col 15, starting at line 9; resource identification: session tokens for several domains); and a security signature for authenticating the selected session information (Col 14, starting at line 60; assigning signed/ cryptographically secured session credentials for different sessions/ domains).

Furthermore, Hinton et al discloses the user preference's for invoking operations at the e-commerce site; the user's preferences for invoking operations at least the determined security domain (Col 17, line 40 to Col 19, line 30; using identity, and selected ecommunity ID in request).

Regarding claim 4, it is rejected applying as above rejecting claim 1, furthermore, Wood et al discloses the method comprising evaluating the requested operation to determine an operation type and wherein said step of performing is performed in accordance with the operation type (Col 15, starting at line 9; accessing requested resources).

Regarding claim 6, it is rejected applying as above rejecting claim 4, furthermore, Wood et al discloses the method wherein the user identity is associated with an identity

type for permitting the invocation of operations; wherein said method comprises receiving the user's request in association with the plurality of sessions persisted for the user and retrieving a user identity for the determined security domain from said plurality of sessions; and wherein said performing is performed in response to the identity type of the retrieved user identity (Col 3, starting at line 1; Col 10, starting at line 48; Col 16, starting at line 35; Claim 1,12; session credentials/ tokens for persistent/ subsequent sessions; Claims 1,12; session credential including user identifying information; session continuity; requests).

Regarding claim 7, Wood et al discloses the method wherein said step of persisting comprises providing one or more cookies defining the session to the user for associating with a subsequent request (Col 8, starting at line 9; Col 13, starting at line 5; Col 15, starting at line 8; Col 16, starting at line 35; session credentials/ cookies/ tokens for persistent/ subsequent sessions).

Regarding claim 8, Wood et al discloses the method wherein the cookies comprise an authentication cookie and a session cookie; and wherein the method comprises authenticating the user's request (Fig 4.410, 420; encrypted login and session credentials/ cookie; Col 9 lines 6-15; Col 14, starting at line 21; claim 23, 24; multiple secured credentials).

Regarding claim 9, Wood et al discloses the method comprising: defining each of the one or more security domains as a hierarchy of organizations and assets owned by the organizations; and wherein said determining the security domain of the plurality of the security domains to which the operation relates comprises evaluating the user's request in accordance with the hierarchy (Col 15, starting at line 8; domain level credentials).

Furhtermore, Hinton et al discloses defining each of the one or more security domains as a hierarchy of organizations and assets owned by the organizations; and wherein said determining the security domain of the plurality of the security domains to which the operation relates comprises evaluating the user's request in accordance with the hierarchy (Col 17, line 10 to Col 19, line 30).

Regarding claim 20, Wood et al discloses the system wherein the identity manager component is adapted to invoke said requested operation with said user identity and role of the session (Fig 1: Gatekeeper; Fig 3A:321, central security architecture).

Regarding claims 11-13 and 15-18, they recite the limitations of claims 1-10, therefore, they are rejected applying as above rejecting claims 1-10.

Regarding claims 21-22 and 24-27, they recite the limitations of claims 1-10 and 20, therefore, they are rejected applying as above rejecting claims 1-10 and 20.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shanto M Z Abedin whose telephone number is 571-272-3551. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Moazzami Nasser, can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. For more information about the PAIR


Art Unit: 2136

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shanto M Z Abedin

Examiner, AU 2136

NASSER MOAZZAMI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100


11/26/07